REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-45 and 49-65 are canceled.

Claims 46-48 are amended.

Claims 46-48 and 66-82 are pending.

****

Main Claims 46-48

Main claims 46-48 are rejected over Helle.

Helle discloses that the remote-controlled secure mode module 54 locks the mobile phone 10 when the owner sends the control message with a lock phone instruction, in which case, the mobile phone 10 goes into a phone locked state, and a phone locked display message shown in FIG. 4 is displayed on the mobile phone 10 (Helle, col 3 line 63 – col 4 line 2).

Helle further discloses that if the mobile phone 10 is lost, stolen or misplaced, the user can send a remote PIN code command to the mobile phone 10 if the need for a PIN code has not already been activated by the user, and the remote-controlled secure mode module 54 performs the functions to activate the need for the user to provide a PIN code in order to use the mobile phone 10 (Helle, col 4 lines 42-48).

Helle further discloses that the status message module 56 allows the user to request information about the mobile phone's status by sending to the phone the control message with such request, and the mobile phone 10 will return information, such as phone location data or last usage data, to the number specified in the control message (Helle, col 4 lines 51-57).

However, Helle does not disclose the communication device controlled notice, as amended by this amendment. Here, the communication device controlled notice is the notice which indicates the outcome of the communication device controlling task.

Assuming that the user enters a user instruction by phone or via the Internet under the present invention. Then the communication device controlling command corresponding to the user instruction is transferred to the communication device, and the communication device implements the communication device controlling task in response to the communication device controlling command.

In response to the implementation of the communication device controlling task, the communication device remotely controlling means transmits the communication device controlling result, and based on the communication device controlling result, the communication device controlled notice which indicates the outcome of the communication device controlling task is output from the phone or via the Internet.

The present invention is directed to notify the user whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device, which is, for example, remotely located from the user. In other words, the present invention provides the method to inform the user whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device by the communication device remotely controlling means transmitting the communication device controlling result in response to the implementation of the communication device controlling task, and based on the communication device controlling result, the communication device controlled notice is output from the phone or via the Internet. Here, the communication device controlled notice is the notice which indicates the outcome of the communication device controlling task, and the user is able to understand whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device by referring to the communication device controlled notice.

Comparing Helle with the present invention, Helle merely discloses that the mobile phone 10 implements certain tasks, such as locking the mobile phone 10 (Helle, col 3 line 63 – col 4 line 2), producing PIN code (Helle, col 4 lines 42-48), and providing

phone location data/last usage data (Helle, col 4 lines 51-57). Helle's disclosure is limited to controlling the mobile phone 10 in a remote fashion, and does not indicate in any way the method to notify the user whether the foregoing tasks have been duly implemented by the mobile phone 10.

In order to inform the user whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device, the present invention depicts that the communication device remotely controlling means transmits the communication device controlling result in response to the implementation of the communication device controlling task. Comparing to the present invention, Helle does not disclose that the communication device remotely controlling means transmits the communication device controlling result in response to the implementation of the communication device controlling task.

The present invention depicts that, based on the communication device controlling result, the communication device controlled notice is output from the phone or via the Internet. Here, the communication device controlled notice is the notice which indicates the outcome of the communication device controlling task, and the user is able to understand whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device by referring to the communication device controlled notice. Helle, on the other hand, does not disclose that, based on the communication device controlling result, the communication device controlled notice is output from the phone or via the Internet, wherein the communication device controlled notice is the notice which indicates the outcome of the communication device controlling task, and thereby the user is able to understand whether the user instruction is duly implemented by the communication device by referring to the communication device controlled notice.

The main claims 46-48 are rejected over Helle on the ground that the following phrase,

in main claim 46 for example, is very broad:

"thereby a communication device controlled notice which indicates the outcome of said communication device controlling task is output from said phone"

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for expressly explaining that the foregoing language can be interpreted as disclosed in Helle: the status message module 56 allows the user to request information about the mobile phone's status by sending it the control message with such a request. The mobile phone 10 would return information, for example, via a Short Message System (SMS), to a number specified in the control message. The information could contain, for example, phone location data or last usage data" (Helle col 4 lines 50-57).

In order to distinguish from Helle, main claims 46-48 are amended so as to depict that the communication device controlled notice indicates whether the communication device controlling task has been implemented or not. In other words, the user can understand from the communication device controlled notice whether the communication device controlling task has been successfully implemented or has failed instead. Applicant believes that this limitation properly distinguishes from Helle which discloses the SMS being sent to a specified number describing the phone location data or last usage data.

Therefore, main claims 46-48 are patentable over Helle.

Sub-Claims 66-82

Sub-claims 66-82 are patentable because main claims 46-48 on which the sub-claims are dependent are patentable.

Each of sub-claims 66-82 describes the specific embodiment of the communication

device controlled notice.

However, Helle, Mooney, Kang, or any combination thereof does not indicate in any way the specific communication device controlled notice depicted in each of sub-claims 66-82.

Therefore sub-claims 66-82 are patentable over Helle, Mooney, and Kang.

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the claims all define patentably over the cited prior art. Therefore, applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action applicant respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the claims so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that applicant can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Misc.

For the avoidance of doubt, each function and/or mode described in the claims presented in this amendment, if any, is capable to be implemented individually.

For the avoidance of doubt, the mode(s) and/or function(s) capable to be implemented by the communication device described in the claims presented in this amendment, if any, is/are not limited to the one(s) described in the claims, i.e., the communication device is capable to implement the mode(s) and/or function(s) other than the mode(s)

and/or function(s) described in the claims.

For the avoidance of doubt, canceling the claims of this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor does not indicate applicant's admission that the invention(s) described in the canceled claims is/are not patentable.

For the avoidance of doubt, abandoning this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor does not indicate applicant's admission that the invention(s) described therein is/are not patentable.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims presented in this amendment by the examples, if any, described in this amendment.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims presented in this amendment by the previous amendment(s), if any, and/or the previous proposed amendment(s), if any, submitted by applicant or the same inventor.

Applicant has no intent to surrender any equivalent of any element included in the claims by any amendment(s), if any, and/or any proposed amendment(s), if any, whether previously or subsequently submitted to this amendment, unless expressly and unambiguously stated otherwise in the amendment(s).

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims or deny the patentability of this application by other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor.

Applicant has no intent to limit the scope of the claims or deny the patentability of other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor by this application.

For the avoidance of doubt, the number of the prior art disclosed in the IDS of this application may be of a large one, however, applicant has no intent to hide the more relevant prior art in the less relevant ones.

For the avoidance of doubt, the number of the prior art disclosed in the IDS of other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor may be of a large one, however, applicant or the same inventor has no intent to hide the more relevant prior art in the less relevant ones.

For the avoidance of doubt, filing a terminal disclaimer for this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor, if any, is not an admission that this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor and the prior patent described in the terminal disclaimer are directed to substantially the same invention.

For the avoidance of doubt, any description in this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor indicating that the invention provides a device capable to implement a plurality of functions where each of the plurality of functions was implemented by an individual device in the prior art merely expresses the multiple functionality of the communication device, and should not be treated as an admission of negating the patentability of the inventions described in this application or other applications filed by applicant or the same inventor, whether this description was/is/will be made in the past, present, or even in the future.

For the avoidance of doubt, the abstract of this application is illustrated in the manner for the readers to conveniently understand the image of the present invention and thereby only a portion of the subject matter of the present invention is described therein. Therefore, the scope of each claim should not be limited by the description of the abstract.

No new matter is added by this amendment.